



## Capital Improvement Program Prioritization Procedure

For Fiscal Year 2022

*Administrative edits to this document may be authorized by the Director or Chief Engineer and General Manager of the Flood Control District of Maricopa County under the authority granted by Resolution FCD 2015R005.*

# Capital Improvement Program Prioritization Procedure

## Purpose of the Procedure

In accordance with Flood Control District of Maricopa County (District) Resolutions 2010R008 and 2015R005, potential Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects submitted by Agencies\* are annually evaluated through this CIP Prioritization Procedure (Procedure).

Through these resolutions, the District Board of Directors (Board) has also resolved that the District shall:

- Determine CIP funding levels based on a balance of needs, funding availability and sustainability;
- Leverage available external funding and cost share to the maximum extent practicable, without compromising the District's mission;
- Use the Procedure to
  - evaluate proposed flood control capital projects;
  - establish funding priority for such projects based upon
    - project readiness and hazard mitigation need; and
    - proposed Agency cost share (which shall be no less than 20% except as approved by the Board);
  - advance annual recommendations of proposed projects to the District's Flood Control Advisory Board for endorsement;
- Advance resolutions for design and construction of recommended projects to the Board for approval; and
- Review and update the Procedure's guidelines and administrative requirements as necessary.

The Procedure applies only to the recommended allocation of CIP resources (funding for design, right-of-way acquisition and construction of flood control capital projects). The District's recommendation of a CIP project and endorsement by the FCAB *does not guarantee funding of the project*. The District's inclusion of a project in its budget requires Agency commitments to proceed, the successful negotiation of associated agreements with the Agency and approval by the Board.

\*Agencies = state, county, city, town and tribal governments as well as political subdivisions and federal government agencies who may partner with the District to improve flood control within Maricopa County.

## Procedural Summary

The annual application of the Procedure results in the following actions:

- District solicits project proposals from Agencies (June)
- Project proposals are submitted by Agencies (late July)
- Project proposals are reviewed and evaluated by the District's Prioritization Evaluation Committee (PEC) as appointed by the Director. Recommended projects are forwarded to the District Director (August)

- The District's project recommendations are presented to the FCAB Program and Budget Committee for their consideration and endorsement; District notifies Agencies of the recommendations (September)
- FCAB Program and Budget Committee Recommendations are presented to the FCAB for their consideration and endorsement (October)
- Procedure results are published (December)

The recommendation of a project through the Procedure precedes final project approval by the Board (in the form of a resolution); however, this final approval is not inevitable. Moreover, a recommendation under this procedure does not, at any level, constitute agreement to cost share in a proposed project.

Once an Agency is ready to move forward with a recommended project, intergovernmental agreements (IGAs) subject to negotiation and approval by the Board and Agency are required and are typically subject to the following common terms

- Standard cost share is 50/50 unless particular project conditions argue otherwise;
- Design/construction/land acquisition lead may be by the Agency or the District; and
- Operations and maintenance is assumed by Agency (except in unincorporated county).

### **Project Proposal Submission Process**

The District typically solicits project proposals from Agencies in May of each year, with Agency project proposals due in July.

*Project proposals and applicable supporting documents must be submitted by email or delivery of a thumb drive to the District contact identified in the solicitation letter.* In order to be evaluated in accordance with the Procedure, project proposals must also include a signed letter of intent (LOI, Attachment A). Proposals should clearly address the prioritization criteria identified below and as further described in the CIP Project Prioritization Scoring Guide (Attachment B).

Maps and similar graphic aids describing prospective project elements are recommended. Additionally, where local (non-District) master plans are referenced, copies of those master plans should be included for reference. Where discrepancies exist between a LOI and the supporting submittal, the information contained within the LOI is considered overriding. The LOI is not a legally binding document, but it assists in establishing a common starting point for negotiating future potential project agreements.

This Procedure, a fillable LOI form and the CIP Project Prioritization Scoring Guide may be found at [www.maricopa.gov/CIP2022](http://www.maricopa.gov/CIP2022)

### **Review of Prior Recommended Projects**

Concurrent with the annual solicitation for project proposals and to assist the District as it develops mid and long-range budget forecasts, Agencies are asked to reconfirm their intent to proceed with its project(s) that have been previously recommended for inclusion in the District's CIP but have not yet entered formal MOU or IGA negotiations. If an Agency intends to proceed with its project, it will also be

asked to identify the funding mechanism and the schedule for implementing the project and to provide updates to project scope and estimated costs if applicable.

If the Agency does not intend to proceed with its project, it is removed from the District's list of recommended CIP projects.

## **Prioritization Criteria**

Prioritization criteria allow the PEC to uniformly evaluate Agency project proposals. Through the weighted criteria listed below, a maximum total of 100 points per project is possible. Providing data in sufficient detail as requested will allow the PEC to award points within the ranges shown on the Prioritization Scoring Guide. No set point threshold exists for the PEC's recommendation that a project proposal be recommended for inclusion in the CIP. Rather, the points awarded are a means to roughly compare the merits of one proposed project to another.

Prioritization criteria, maximum point values and ranges and associated information requirements are described below and shown on Attachment B.

### **0. Project Description (0 Points)**

A summary of the proposed project, including a location map and information concerning project goals, flooding hazards to be addressed, anticipated project features, and relationships to any other planned, ongoing or completed infrastructure projects must be provided.

### **1. Funding Commitment and Agency Priority (12 Points)**

The rank in priority (from first to last, if applicable) among the Agency's current fiscal year project proposals must be provided. A number of integrated projects required to improve a particular watershed may be consolidated and classified as a single, phased project.

Agencies must identify their financial commitment and schedule for the proposed project. The project proposal should answer some or all of these questions:

- Is the Agency ready to fund and implement the proposed project and enter into an IGA?
- Is the proposed project part of or consistent with an articulated, short or long-range Agency CIP program or FCD or Agency's departmental strategic plan? If so, the component of the program or plan identifying the project should be included in the project proposal.
- Does the proposed project have a current schedule of funding, implementation, including anticipated milestones and deliverables?
- Grant Funding (e.g., Two additional points may be earned from the above three sub-criteria if funding in whole or in part for the project will be through a third-party grant funding source).

### **2. Flood Control/Drainage Master Plan Element (8 Points)**

The relationship of the proposed project to existing or ongoing flood control, stormwater management or drainage master plans must be identified. Points will be awarded on the basis of the project's relative significance or priority within the overall plan. If the associated master plan was formally adopted (e.g., through council action) by the submitting Agency, this should be

indicated on the LOI. If the associated master plan was completed by an entity other than the District, then a copy of the plan (or an executive summary) must be provided with the project proposal.

**3. Flooding Threat (15 Points)**

Existing threats to property that will be mitigated by the proposed project must be described. Fewer points are awarded to those proposed projects that are intended to resolve flooding threat issues caused by inadequate regulation by the requesting Agency and to those that only protect roadways. The project proposal should answer some or all of these questions

- Is the project intended to address an existing flooding hazard?
- Has documented flooding of structures occurred that would be prevented or lessened in the future by the proposed project? If so, on how many occasions has documented flooding occurred? What was the extent of the damage caused? If citizen flooding complaints or photos are available, copies should be included with the project submittal.
- Will the proposed project mitigate flooding hazards in a delineated floodway/floodplain? If so, was the floodway/floodplain delineated before or after development in the affected area?
- What are the peak discharges and frequency of flooding events?
- What are the depth, velocity and duration of stormwater flow?
- What are the characteristics of the contributing watershed (size, slope, land use, etc.)?
- Does an outfall exist? If so, is it undersized, at full capacity or capable of handling additional flows?

**4. Level of Protection (10 Points)**

The flood return frequency protection in comparison to protection under existing conditions should be identified. More points are awarded to proposed projects offering higher flood return frequency (10-year to 100-year) protection. When applicable, information regarding both the anticipated design level of protection and the effective level of protection (such as that provided by storm drains combined with curb and gutter roadways) should be provided.

**5. Area Protected (25 Points)**

Characteristics of the geographic area protected by the proposed project must be identified. The project proposal should answer these questions:

- What are the numbers and estimated values of benefitted residential, commercial and industrial buildings that are located in delineated floodways or 100-year floodplains?
- What are the numbers and estimated values of benefitted residential, commercial and industrial buildings that are not located in delineated floodplains?
- What is the number of benefitted public buildings (schools, libraries, churches, etc.)?
- What amount of infrastructure (roads, drainage/flood control or wastewater facilities, etc.) would benefit or be enhanced (e.g., storm drain capacity increase from 2-10 years.)?
- What is the amount of benefitted cultivated acreage?
- What is the acreage of developed, agricultural and undeveloped land to be removed from the 100-year floodplain?

- What current population would directly and indirectly benefit from the project?
- What is the age of area development, and how long has the flooding problem existed?
- Would a floodway/floodplain be reduced and/or the community's floodplain rating be improved through project completion?

## 6. **Ancillary Benefits (12 Points)**

Non-flood control benefits of the proposed project should be identified. Benefits may include:

- *Water conservation/recharge opportunities* Additional points may be awarded if ancillary benefits are likely. Will the proposed project:
  - Promote the efficient reuse of stormwater?
  - Sustain or increase groundwater levels?
  - Improve aquifer water quality?
- *Low Impact Development (LID)* Additional points may be awarded if the proposed project will include alternative stormwater management techniques, green stormwater infrastructure, low impact development methods or features.
- *Community Economic Impacts* Additional points may be awarded if one of the following is applicable:
  - Does the proposed project provide infrastructure needed for economic development?
  - Will the project enhance economic diversification, business expansion and economic growth?
  - Is the project consistent with the Agency's development general plan?
- *Water quality improvement* Will storm-water be managed through basins or wetlands that improve its quality prior to its discharge to the receiving waters?
- *Vegetation and wildlife habitat improvement* Will an existing wildlife corridor be maintained/enhanced, or will new habitat areas be created through the provision of dedicated drainage/open space areas? Does the proposed project require disturbance mitigation and landscape restoration with native species?
- *Are Environmentally sensitive areas* (e.g., designated wildlife areas or riparian corridors) protected?
- Are multiple-use features (such as ground water enhancement either through groundwater percolation, infiltration or direct recharge), that also support alternative forms of transportation (such as multi-use trails and bike paths), passive and active recreation opportunities, restoration of riparian and native desert habitats and other open space uses and activities included in the proposed plan?
- Does the proposed project contribute to the visual quality of the environment through preservation or enhancement of the natural character of the landscapes of Maricopa County and/or enhancement of local community character?
- Are cultural and historic resources preserved or enhanced? Is shade and tree canopy cover increased and impervious surfaces reduced? Does the proposed project create opportunities for conservation education within the community?

**7. Level of Partner Participation (12 Points)\***

The decision to recommend a project is based, in part, on the cost share proposed by the Agency at the time the project is proposed. Negotiations of IGAs to design and construct recommended projects customarily start with a fifty-percent cost share contribution from its partners though variations from this customary percentage could be justified. However, when such projects are constructed in incorporated jurisdictions, in no case shall cost share be less than 20%, except as approved by the Board.

If the project has an economic development component, the Agency and the development beneficiary are expected to contribute a higher level of cost share participation, with the District contributing the least cost share among the project partners and/or beneficiaries. If a future bond election is identified as a source of funding, this should be identified in the LOI. Forms of cost share participation may include:

- Direct Agency funding (e.g., bonds, or property/sales tax revenues);
- Ad-valorem tax contributions to the District;
- Non-cash contributions (e.g., rights of way);
- Previously-acquired land required for the project, and;
- Third-party funding sources (e.g., federal funds or private contributions).

**8. Operations and Maintenance Costs to the District (6 Points)\***

More points are awarded to project proposals where minimal operations and maintenance costs are to be borne by the District.

\*The information provided in prioritization criteria 7 and 8 above will be considered during negotiation of project partnering agreements for each particular project.

**Points of Contact**

For general questions regarding the Capital Improvement Program:

Don Rerick, P.E.  
Planning and Project Management Division Manager  
Don.Rerick@Maricopa.Gov  
602-506-4878

For questions concerning the Prioritization Procedure and project proposals:

Kim Belt, CPM  
Capital Improvement Program Supervisor  
Kim.Belt@Maricopa.Gov  
602-506-3639

Attachment A: Letter of Intent



**Flood Control Capital Project Letter of Intent**

Reset Form

Print Form

Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Submitting Agency: \_\_\_\_\_

**1. General**

A. Project Area  
\_\_\_\_\_

B. Summary Project Description  
\_\_\_\_\_

C. Estimated Project Cost  
\_\_\_\_\_

**2. Proposed Lead Agency by Task** (For each task, indicate "District", City/Agency name, or "Not Applicable")

A. Design  
\_\_\_\_\_

B. Rights-of-Way Acquisition  
\_\_\_\_\_

C. Construction  
\_\_\_\_\_

D. Operations and Maintenance  
\_\_\_\_\_

**3. Proposed Cost Share**

	District	City/Agency	Other	Total
A. Percentage	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

B. Dollars				\$0.00
------------	--	--	--	--------

**4. Estimated Availability of City/Agency Funding (Dollars)**

FY 2021/22	FY 2022/23	FY 2023/24	FY 2024/25	FY2025/26	Later FYs

**5. Master Plan/Study Applicable to Submitted Project**

A. Title (if applicable) \_\_\_\_\_

B. Adopted by City/Agency? ☐ Adopted ☐ Not Adopted ☐ Pending ☐ Not Applicable

**6. Agency Approval** (City Engineer, Public Works Director, or Agency Manager)

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Printed Name \_\_\_\_\_ Title \_\_\_\_\_

**Submittals must adhere to the CIP Prioritization Procedure guidelines - in particular:** (1) Explicitly and quantitatively address the evaluation criteria identified by the CIP Prioritization Procedure, giving particular attention to quantifying flood control benefits; (2) include maps and other graphic attachments demonstrating the conceptual components of the project; (3) provide corresponding signed letters of intent; (4) if a non-District study generated the project, provide one copy of the study.



## Attachment B: CIP Project Prioritization Scoring Guide

### Prioritization Scoring Guide

Factor	Range			PEC Points
Agency Priority	<u>Low</u> 0	<u>Med</u> 1-4	<u>High</u> 5-12	12
High Range: Funding is identified in the municipalities' 5-year CIP, project partner is ready to enter into an intergovernmental Agreement, Project is ranked 1st or 2nd among agency's submittals, and funding is in whole or in part via a third party "Grant Funding" source.				
Med. Range: Funding is likely to be identified in the municipalities' 5-year CIP and/or Project is ranked between 3rd or 4th among agency's submittals.				
Low Range: Funding is not identified in the municipalities' 5-year CIP, or Project is ranked 5th (or lower) among agency's submittals				
Flood Control/Drainage Master Plan Element	<u>Low</u> 0-4	<u>Med</u> 5-6	<u>High</u> 7-8	8
High Range: Project is directly recommended by a formal regional flood control/drainage master plan/study acceptable to the District.				
Med. Range: Project is directly recommended by a formal flood control/drainage master plan/study that is non-regional but examines impact across a municipality or over a significant portion of it; or, project is a modified component of a regional flooding/drainage master plan that accomplishes a portion of the master plan's intent				
Low Range: Project is identified by a localized flooding/drainage study that does not address overall system effectiveness; or the need for the submitted project is not identified by any flooding/drainage study				
Flooding Threat	<u>Low</u> 0-5	<u>Med</u> 6-12	<u>High</u> 13-15	15
High Range: Project mitigates residential/commercial flooding identified by a delineated floodplain where development regulations are insufficient or where development occurred prior to floodplain delineation; or mitigates flooding in a non-delineated flood hazard area subjected to frequent historic flooding				
Med. Range: Project mitigates residential/commercial flooding identified by a delineated floodplain (or mitigates flooding in a non-delineated flood hazard area subjected to frequent historic flooding) where development regulations addressed (or will address) the primary flooding threat, but where some flooding threat remains				
Low Range: Project mitigates a minor or questionable flooding threat to structures; or only protects roadways				
Level of Protection	<u>&lt;10 yr</u> 0	<u>10-50 yr</u> 3-7	<u>&gt;50 yr</u> 8-10	10
>50 yr: Project generates a level of protection from events more severe than a 50-year storm (where that level of protection does not currently exist)				
10-50 yr: Project generates a level of protection from events between a 10-year and 50-year level of severity (where that level of protection does not currently exist)				
>10 yr: Project generates a level of protection from events less than a 10-year level of severity - the District typically would not participate in projects of this scope				
Area Protected	<u>Low</u> 0-8	<u>Med</u> 9-16	<u>High</u> 17-25	25
High Range: Project protects a large area of highly-populated land with significant infrastructure, or provides a particularly cost effective solution for a smaller area of highly-populated land with significant infrastructure				
Medium Range: Project protects a large area of lightly-populated land, or a smaller area of highly-populated land, or provides a regional facility for multiple large-scale future developments				
Low Range: Project does not meet the above criteria				
Ancillary Benefits	0-4	5-8	9-12	12
High Range: Project provides water conservation/recharge opportunities, Low Impact Development method opportunities, a significant recreational amenity, alleviates major roadway flooding, substantially benefits the environment, or provides some other major quality of life improvement				
Medium Range: Project provides ancillary benefits in a less substantial manner than a "high range" project				
Low Range: Project does not provide ancillary benefits, or provides insignificant ancillary benefits				
Level of Partner(s) Participation	<u>&lt;50%</u> 0-4	<u>50%</u> 5-8	<u>&gt;50%</u> 9-12	12
>50%: Non-District partners will contribute greater than 50% of the project's estimated total cost				
50%: Non-District partners will contribute 50% of the project's estimated total cost.				
<50%: Non-District partners will contribute less than 50% of the project's estimated total cost				
O&M Costs to the District	<u>High</u> 0	<u>Low</u> 1-5	<u>None</u> 6	6
None: The proposed project will create no additional O&M costs expected to be borne by the District				
Low: The proposed project will create minor additional O&M costs expected to be borne by the District				
High: The proposed project will create significant additional O&M costs expected to be borne by the District				
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>100</b>